

Appl. No. 10/652,890  
Amdt. Dated July 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187  
Customer No.: 26021

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 8-11, 13, 21-24 and 26-30 are canceled without prejudice. Claims 2, 5, 15 and 18 are amended. Claims 2-6, 12, 15-19 and 25 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

Claims 12 and 25 are allowed.

Claims 2-6 and 15-19 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. In response claims 2, 5, 15 and 18 have been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 2, 5, 15 and 18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from independent amended independent claim 2 and as such, are now dependent on an allowable independent base claim. Allowance of claims 3 and 4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 depends from independent amended independent claim 5 and as such, is now dependent on an allowable independent base claim. Allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from independent amended independent claim 15 and as such, is now dependent on an allowable independent base claim. Allowance of claims 16 and 17 is respectfully requested.

Claims 19 depends from independent amended independent claim 18 and as such, is now dependent on an allowable independent base claim. Allowance of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/652,890  
Amdt. Dated July 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187  
Customer No.: 26021

***Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §§112, 102 and 103***

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8, 9, 13, 21, 22, 26, 27, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farooq et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,200,400).

Claims 10 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farooq et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,200,400) in view of Ikeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,656,113).

Claims 11 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farooq et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,200,400) in view of Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,603,147).

These rejections are all rendered moot due to the cancellation of claim 8-11, 13, 21-24, and 26-30 without prejudice.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6810 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/652,890  
Amdt. Dated July 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of April 14, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 81707.0187  
Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: July 13, 2005

By: 

Lawrence J. McClure

Registration No. 44,228

Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Phone: 213-337-6700  
Fax: 213-337-6701